CIVIL COVER SILEEI	County in which this action arose <u>wayne</u>
The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supply local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United Stathe civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)	ement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided tes in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Brian Rundel	DEFENDANTS City of Detroit, Detroit Police Department Officer Travis Kostanko and Officer William

Brian Rundel (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Wayne			City of Detroit, Detroit Police Department Officer Travis Kostanko and Officer William Zeolla County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Wayne					
							•	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS
			NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.					
Brian Randazzo	Address, and Telephone Number), 2731 S. Adams s, MI 48309 (24	Road, Suite	100	Attorneys (If Known) Marion R. 1650 First 48226 (313	. National	Build		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in (One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P			Place an "X" in C	
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	図 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	Not a Party)				porated <i>or</i> Pri	ncipal Place	PTF DEF
2 U.S. Government . Defendant	4 Diversity(Indicate Citizenship	o of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State		porated <i>and</i> P. Business In A		O 5 O 5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗍 3 Fore	ign Nation		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			in heim owner	Company of the second of the s		- ALCOHOLISM PHILIS		
######################################					T			STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Forcelosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 315 Airplane Product Liability CK 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 341 Voting 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONERSPETITIONS 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition		10 Agriculture 20 Other Food & Drug 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 30 Liquor Laws 40 R.R. & Truck 50 Airline Regs. 60 Occupational Safety/Health 90 Other ************************************	422 Appeal 28 U 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 425 USC 157 426 USC 20 427 USC 28 USC 28 USC 28 USC 28 USC 28 USC 28 USC 26 USC 28 USC 28 USC 28 USC 26	IGHITS IRTPY () (923) (923) (V(405(g)) XVI) XSUITS Plaintiff () Party	Corrupt of 480 Consum 480 Consum 490 Cable/S 310 Selectiv Exchang 775 Custom 12 USC 890 Other S 891 Agricult 892 Econom 893 Environ 894 Energy 895 Freedon Act 900Appeal of	st and Banking stree strion serion ser Influenced and Organizations ner Credit sat TV se Service ses/Commodities/ se er Challenge 3410 tatutory Actions tural Acts nic Stabilization Act nof Information of Fee Determination of Fee Determination se entionality of
□1 Original □ 2 R	tate Court A	Remanded from Appellate Court	Reor	stated or another stated or speci-		Litigation	ct 🗖 7 h	Appeal to District udge from Magistrate udgment
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	DN Brief description of car	ute under which you are feet 10n 1983. use: Assault a					1	
VII. REQUESTED IN	CHECK IF THIS I			EMAND \$ 25,000	CLIECT	VFS only	f demanded in	complaint:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P.	S A CLASS ACTION 23				DEMAND:	i demanded in ⊠ Yes	□ No
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY		JUDGE			DOCKET NU	MBER	·	
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	RNEY	OF RECORD				

PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 83.11

1.	Is this a case that has been previously dismissed?	Yes
If yes, give	e the following information:	x No
Co u rt:		
Case No.:		
2.	Other than stated above, are there any pending or previously discontinued or dismissed companion cases in this or any other court, including state court? (Companion cases are matters in which it appears substantially similar evidence will be offered or the same or related parties are present and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence.)	Yes No
If yes, give	e the following information:	
Court:		
Case No.:		
	, , ,	
Notes :	V.	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT - SOUTHERN DIVISION

BRIAN RUNDEL,

Plaintiff,

USDC Case No. Honorable:

vs.

CITY OF DETROIT, DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICER TRAVIS KOSTANKO, and OFFICER WILLIAM ZEOLLA,

Defendants.

DANIEL RANDAZZO (P-34935)

Attorney for Plaintiff 2731 S. Adams Road, Suite 100 Rochester Hills, MI 48309 (248) 853-1003

MARION R. JENKINS (P-26237)

Assistant Corporation Counsel Attorney for Defendant City of Detroit 660 Woodward Avenue 1650 First National Building Detroit, MI 48226 (313) 237-3032

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

NOW COMES Defendant, City of Detroit, a municipal corporation, by and through its undersigned counsel and for its Notice of Removal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1441 says as follows:

- 1. This action was commenced on March 27, 2009 in the Circuit Court for the Third Judicial Circuit of Michigan and is now pending in that court.
- 2. On April 8, 2009, a Summons and a copy of the Complaint in this action was served on the Defendant.
- 3. On information and belief, no Defendant other than the Defendant filing this notice has been served in this action. Inspection of Wayne County Circuit Court records for Civil Action No. 09-007226 NO shows no proof of service has been filed with respect to any other Defendant.
 - 4. The Plaintiff alleges in his Complaint that he is a resident of Michigan.
 - 5. This is a civil action in which the Plaintiff seeks monetary relief for the alleged

K:\DOCS\LIT\JENKMR\A37000\REMOVAL\ML7314.WPD

misconduct of the Defendant which is alleged to have resulted in the deprivation of certain rights protected by provisions of the United States Constitution. The Defendant removes the action to this Court, invoking the Court's federal question jurisdiction, because the Plaintiff bases the action on the United States Constitution and on 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983.

- 6. This Court has original jurisdiction of this civil action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1331, and the action is removable to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Secs. 1441(a) and (b).
- 7. That pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1367 this Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the common law state claims Plaintiff alleges.
- 8. Copies of all pleadings served upon the Defendants are attached. The Defendant has received no orders concerning this action.
- 9. This Notice is filed within thirty days after first receipt by any Defendant of a copy of the Complaint, which is the initial pleading setting forth the claim for relief upon which this action is based.
- 10. This action is not removed on the basis of jurisdiction conferred by 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1331 and is removed within one year after commencement of the action.
- 11. The undersigned has prepared a written notice of the removal of this action addressed to counsel for the Plaintiff and to the Clerk of the Court from which this action is being removed. Promptly after filing this Notice of Removal of Civil Action, the undersigned will cause copies of that written notice to be filed with the Clerk of the Court from which this action is being removed and mailed by first-class mail to counsel for the Plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, Defendant, City of Detroit, a municipal corporation, removes this action to this Court.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Marion R. Jenkins

Assistant Corporation Counsel Attorney for Defendant City of Detroit 660 Woodward Avenue 1650 First National Building Detroit, MI 48226

2:09-cv-11586-GER-MKM Doc # 2 Filed 04/28/09 Pg 5 of 22 Pg ID 27

(313) 237-3032 <u>Jenkmr@detroitmi.gov</u> (P-26257)

Dated: April 27, 2009

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 27, 2009, I electronically filed the foregoing paper with the Clerk of the court using the ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Daniel Randazzo 2731 S. Adams Road, Suite 100 Rochester Hills, MI 48304-5513

and hereby certify that I have mailed by United States Postal Service the paper to the following non-ECF participants(s):

None.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Marion R. Jenkins

Assistant Corporation Counsel
Attorney for Defendant City of Detroit
660 Woodward Avenue
1650 First National Building
Detroit, MI 48226
(313) 237-3032
Jenkmr@detroitmi.gov
(P-26257)

Dated: April 27, 2009

STATE OF MICHIGAN IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF WAYNE

BRIAN RUNDEL,

Plaintiff,

Case No. Honorable:

VS.

CITY OF DETROIT, DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICER TRAVIS KOSTANKO, and OFFICER WILLIAM ZEOLLA,

Defendants.

DANIEL RANDAZZO (P-34935)

Attorney for Plaintiff 2731 S. Adams Road, Suite 100 Rochester Hills, MI 48309 (248) 853-1003

MARION R. JENKINS (P-26237)

Assistant Corporation Counsel
Attorney for Defendant City of Detroit
660 Woodward Avenue
1650 First National Building
Detroit, MI 48226
(313) 237-3032

NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION TO U.S. DISTRICT COURT

TO: Daniel Randazzo

2731 S. Adams Road, Suite 100 Rochester Hills, MI 48309

Clerk of the Court

Wayne County Circuit Court Two Woodward Avenue

201 Coleman A. Young Municipal Center

Detroit, MI 48226

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on April 27, 2009, the Defendant, City of Detroit, filed a NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF CIVIL ACTION to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan. A copy of that Removal is attached. This action is thereby removed to the United States District Court, and this Court is precluded from proceeding further unless and until the case is remanded.

Respectfully submitted,

Marion R. Jenkins (P-26257)
Assistant Corporation Counsel
Attorney for Defendant City of Detroit
660 Woodward Avenue

K:\DOCS\LIT\JENKMR\A37000\REMOVAL\ML7314.WPD

1650 First National Building Detroit, MI 48226 (313) 237-3032

Dated: April 27, 2009

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A - Summons

Exhibit B - Complaint

EXHIBIT A

Summons



SUMMONS AND

ETURN	OF	SERVICE	
•			•

1 (2312 301)-041 (1211 2312) 1101				
COURT ADDRESS: 2 WOODWARD AV	ENUE, DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48	3226	COURT TELEPHONE NO. (313)	224-
THIS CASE ASSIGNED TO JU	DGE: Kathleen Macd	onald	Bar Numbe	r: 38029
PLAINTII	- FF		DEFENDANT	
RUNDEL,	BRIAN	VS	DETROIT CITY O	7
PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY	(r D
Randazzo, Daniel (P-39935) 2731 S Adams Rd Rochester Hills, (248) 853-1003	Ste 100		E I V E D /: 0 8 2009 OF DETROIT EPARTMENT	91 2 pm
CASE FILING FEE		JURY FEE	= '- ''	
Paid		Paid	oderovinet langitud toden et al oct et a	To find one of the end
ISSUED	THIS SUMMONS EXPIRES	DEPUTY COUNTY CLE	RK	
03/27/2009 *This summons is invalid unless served	06/26/2009	Pamela Ol Cathy M. Garrett – Way		
1. You are being sued. 2. YOU HAVE 21 DAYS after recont other lawful action (28 days if an arrow of the complaint. There is no other pending or previously filed in There is no other pending or family members of the parties An action within the jurisdiction been previously filed in	every control of the people of	nswer with the court a were served outside ed, judgment may be f the same transactio of the transaction or of liction of the family d	and serve a copy on the or this state). entered against you for to on or occurrence as alleged occurrence alleged in the ivision of circuit court inv	he relief demanded ed in the complaint. complaint has been Court. colving the family or
Docket no.	Judge			Bar no.
The action remark declare that the complaint information	ains is no longer penation above and attached is true t	ending. o the best of my inforn	nation, knowledge, and	TANA STATE OF THE
				27 Hallian 2.15

COMPLAINT IS STATED ON ATTACHED PAGES. EXHIBITS ARE ATTACHED IF REQUIRED BY COURT RULE.

Signature of attorney/plaintiff

If you require special accommodations to use the court because of disabilities, please contact the court immediately to make arrangement.

Date

EXHIBIT B

Complaint



STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY WAYNE

BRIAN RUNDEL

Case: Hon:

NO

Plaintiff,

٧.

CITY OF DETROIT, DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICER TRAVIS KOSTANKO And OFFICER WILLIAM ZEOLLA

Defendants.

DANIEL RANDAZZO (P39935)
Attorney for Plaintiff
2731 S. Adams Rd., Suite 100
Rochester Hills, MI 48309
(248) 853-1003

There is no other civil action between these parties arising out of the same transaction as alleged in this complaint pending in this Court. An action had been previously filed and dismissed without prejudice in Federal Court involving these parties: that being case number: 2.:08-CV-13194.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Brian Rundel, by and through his attorney, Daniel Randazzo, and for his complaint against Defendants, City of Detroit, Detroit Police Department, Officer Travis Kostanko, and Officer William Zeolla, states as follows:

- 1. That at the time of the incident Plaintiff, Brian Rundel (hereinafter "Rundel"), was a resident of the County of Wayne, State of Michigan.
- 2. That Defendant, City of Detroit, (hereinafter "City of Detroit") is a municipal corporation located in the State of Michigan, as is it's political subdivision, City

- of Detroit Police Department (hereinafter "Police Department"), which operations are largely conducted in Wayne County.
- 3. That all time hereto, Officers Travis Kostanko and William Zeolla were each law enforcement officers with the City of Detroit Police Department on or about May 26, 2007.
- 4. This is a civil action brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 and 42 U.S.C. §1983, seeking money damages against Defendants for depriving Plaintiff of his constitutionally protected rights under color of law.
- 5. That at all times herein mentioned, Defendant police officers were acting during the course of their employment, and were exceeding the scope of their authority, while acting under color of state law.
- 6. That all times relevant hereto, the City of Detroit, employed the Defendant officers and is liable for the acts of its deputy officers. NO 175 NOT!
- 7. That all times relevant hereto, City of Detroit is also liable because it allowed policies, practices, and prior customs of using excessive force, which lead to this complaint.
- 8. That the amount in controversy exceeds Twenty-Five Thousand (\$25,000.00) dollars, exclusive of interest, costs, and attorney fees.
- 9. That City of Detroit, is liable for all injuries proximately caused by:
 - a. Intentional wrongful acts of its employees and/or agents committed during the course of their employment and within the scope of authority;

- Intentional, wanton, reckless, deliberately indifferent, grossly negligent and/or negligent acts and/or omissions which deprive citizens of their rights, privileges and/or immunities;
- c. All intentional and ultra vires conduct of its agents, employees, and officers; and
- d. All negligent and otherwise wrongful violations of their agents, employees and officer wrongful implementation of their ministerial duties.
- 10. The events from which this cause of action arose, occurred on or about May 26, 2007, in the city of Redford, County of Wayne, State of Michigan, at approximately 10:30pm.
- 11. The events out of which this cause of action arose took place at 20461 Centralia, Redford, Michigan.
- 12. That Defendant police officers did, during the course of their contact with Rundel, make unjustified, unprivileged, unconsented and unlawful contact with Rundel while acting under color of state law, during the course of their employment and within apparent/implied scope of that authority, but exceeding that authority.
- 13. The factual predicate of the Defendants' individual, joint and several liability, is as follows:
- a. On the above date the officers named, while on routine patrol stopped a vehicle that Rundel was driving. Rundel ran from the vehicle. The officers pursued him. Upon apprehending Rundel, the officers beat and kicked him, causing Rundel to suffer severe injuries.

- b. Rundel was transported to Botsford Hospital where he was diagnosed with an acute closed head injury and closed nasal bone fracture, along with multiple bruises and contusions on his body.
- c. He remained in the hospital until his discharged on May 28, 2007.
- 14. The actions of the individual officers were intentional, unjustified, negligent, grossly negligent, wanton, reckless, deliberately indifferent, malicious, and oppressive without regard to human dignity or presence.
- 15. That as a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct,
 Rundel suffered the following injuries:
 - a. abrasions to his face;
 - b. a swollen left eye;
 - c. fracture of his nasal bones;
 - d. closed head injury;
 - e. other disorders caused by the head injury;
 - f. cracked teeth; and
 - g. injury to left foot

Count I

42 U.S.C §1983 – Constitutional Deprivation

Individual Police Officer Defendants

- 16. Rundel realleges all prior paragraphs as though fully restated herein.
- 17. At all times mentioned herein, while the individual officers were acting under the color of statute, ordinances, regulations and/or customs of the State of Michigan, County of Wayne, City of Detroit, when they subjected Rundel to a deprivation of

- his rights, privileges, and immunities secured to him by the Constitutions and laws of the United States and State of Michigan.
- 18. The Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. §1983, provides for civil liability for the deprivation of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States while committed under color of law.
- 19. The individual officers are civilly liable to Rundel pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 as all of the above-described negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, wanton, malicious and/or intentional acts and omissions of the individual officers, as set forth above in the common allegations were committed under color of law, subjected Rundel to the deprivation of his rights, privileges and immunities secured by the United State Constitution, against excessive force as exercised by the individual officers herein.
- 20. The individual officers are liable to Rundel under the United State and Michigan Constitutions for all of the aforementioned negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, wanton, malicious and/or intentional acts and omissions, including failure to train, practices and policies of the Police Department while committed under color of law, which resulted in the deprivation of Rundel's liberty and health without due process of law and the inflicting of cruel and unusual punishment upon Rundel, all of which were the proximate cause of Rundel's injuries.
- 21. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct and Constitutional violations, Rundel suffered the following injuries:
 - a. abrasions to his face;
 - b. a swollen left eye;

- c. fracture of his nasal bones;
- d. closed head injury;
- e. other disorders caused by the head injury;
- f. cracked teeth; and
- g. injury to left foot

WHEREFORE, Rundel seeks judgment against the police officers individually, jointly and severally, for damages in whatever amount in excess of Twenty-Five Thousand (\$25,000.00) dollars to which Rundel is entitled which is reasonable, fair, just, plus costs, interest, and attorney fees together with punitive damages.

Count II

Violation of Ministerial Duties

- 22. Rundel realleges all prior paragraphs as though fully restated herein.
- 23. At all relevant times herein, the individual officers had the following ministerial duties, notwithstanding their standard duty of care;
 - a. to avoid the use of excessive, undue force in the apprehension of Rundel;
 - b. to obey all statutes, rules, regulations, and applicable laws; and
 - c. to preserve the peace and protect the lawful rights of citizens.
- 24. That all of the individual officers breached, in a negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, wanton, malicious and/or intentional fashion, one or more of the aforesaid ministerial duties by:
 - a. negligently, grossly negligently, recklessly, wantonly, maliciously and/or intentionally refusing to use due care during the arrest of Rundel;

- b. negligently, grossly negligently, recklessly, wantonly, maliciously and/or intentionally refusing to obey those statues, rules, and regulations and applicable laws pertaining to the arrest, detention, and general treatment of persons in Rundel's situation; and
- c. negligently, grossly negligently, recklessly, wantonly, maliciously and/or intentionally failing to preserve the peace and protect the lawful rights of Rundel.
- 25. That as a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct,
 Rundel suffered the following injuries:
 - a. abrasions to his face;
 - b. a swollen left eye;
 - c. fracture of his nasal bones; and
 - d. closed head injury;
 - e. other disorders caused by the head injury;
 - f. cracked teeth; and
 - g. injury to left foot

WHEREFORE, Rundel seeks judgment against the police officers individually, jointly and severally, for damages in whatever amount in excess of Twenty-Five Thousand (\$25,000.00) dollars to which Rundel is entitled which is reasonable, fair, just, plus costs, interest, and attorney fees together with punitive damages.

Count III

42 U.S.C. §1983 - Constitutional Deprivation

Defendant City of Detroit

- 26. Rundel realleges all prior paragraphs as though fully restated herein.
- 27. At all times relevant herein, Defendant, City of Detroit, by its own custom, policy and/or practice of failing to properly recruit, psychologically pre-test, and thereafter train, evaluate, supervise, investigate, review and/or discipline its police officers, allowed one or more of the individual person Defendants to function as police officers and to use excessive force in the beating of Rundel, which violated Rundel's constitutional rights in the use of excessive force.
- 28. Defendant, City of Detroit, is liable for its intentional, wanton, reckless, grossly negligent and/or negligent acts and/or omissions pursuant to customs, policies and/or practices which resulted in the beating of Rundel, which constituted excessive force in violation of the United States and Michigan Constitutions.
- 29. Defendant, City of Detroit, is liable for its acts and/or omissions resulting in the violation of the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Michigan.
- 30. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct and Constitutional violations, Rundel suffered the following injuries:
 - a. abrasions to his face;
 - b. a swollen left eye;
 - c. fracture of his nasal bones; and
 - d. closed head injury;
 - e. other disorders caused by the head injury;
 - f. cracked teeth; and
 - g. injury to left foot

WHEREFORE, Rundel seeks judgment against the police officers individually, jointly and severally, for damages in whatever amount in excess of Twenty-Five Thousand (\$25,000.00) dollars to which Rundel is entitled which is reasonable, fair, just, plus costs, interest, and attorney fees together with punitive damages.

Count IV

Gross Negligence

- 31. Rundel realleges all prior paragraphs as though fully restated herein.
- 32. At all times relevant hereto, the individual police officers were under a duty to avoid engaging in conduct so reckless as to demonstrate a substantial lack of concern for whether injury was likely to result there from to amount to gross negligence as defined in MCL 691-1407(7).
- 33. The individual Defendant police officers did breach this duty by unjustifiably beating Rundel and are liable pursuant to MCL 691.1407(2).
- Rundel demands that Defendants' pay damages incurred, including payment of all Rundel's out-of-pocket expenses incurred as a result of Defendants' gross negligence.

WHEREFORE, Rundel seeks judgment against the police officers individually, jointly and severally, for damages in whatever amount in excess of Twenty-Five Thousand (\$25,000.00) dollars to which Rundel is entitled which is reasonable, fair, just, plus costs, interest, and attorney fees together with punitive damages.

DANIEL RANDAZZO (P. 993

STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY WAYNE

BRIAN RUNDEL

Case:

Hon:

Plaintiff,

٧.

CITY OF DETROIT, DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICER TRAVIS KOSTANKO And OFFICER WILLIAM ZEOLLA

Defendants.

DANIEL RANDAZZO (P39935) Attorney for Plaintiff 2731 S. Adams Rd., Suite 100 Rochester Hills, MI 48309 (248) 853-1003

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff, Brian Rundel, by and through his attorney, Daniel Randazzo, and hereby requests a trial by jury.

DANIEL RANDAZZO (\$39935)

Attorney for Plaintiff

2731 S. Adams Rd., Suite 100 Rochester Hills, MI 48309

(248) 853-1003

Dated: March 26, 2009